

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT

Application Ref: H/25/99306

Site Address: 4 LADYWOOD, EASTLEIGH, SO50 4RW

Case Officer: Charlie Vallis

Description: Single storey pitched roof side extension.

Particular Site Constraints?	Yes ☒	No ☐
• Within the urban edge • Tree Preservation Order(s) – 318-E		

Planning History?	Yes ☒	No ☐
• Z/18009/000/00 – Proposed housing development 54 houses and garages Permit – Mar 1978 • Z/18009/001/00 – Detailed application for houses and drainage Permit – Nov 1978		

Publicity:	Letters ☐	Site Notice ☐	Newspaper ☐
Representations:	None were received		
Parish Council:	No comments received		
Tree Officer:	There are a number of protected trees, both on site and on neighbouring properties. Most of these will not be influenced by either the proposal or construction activities. However, we have some concerns regarding the tree closest to the proposed development area located in No. 5. Without arboricultural information, it is not possible to fully assess, but it is likely that the tree will not be directly impacted. More likely, the root system could be impacted by construction access and activities, and this element will need consideration. Therefore, we raise no arboricultural objection to the proposal, subject to a condition requiring a Tree Protection Plan.		

Site Visit:	Yes ☒	No ☐
Details: 05/06/2025		

Policy:
National Planning Policy Framework Planning Practice Guidance
Development Plan: The <u>Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2016-2036</u> The most relevant policies are Strategic policies S1 and S2; and Development Management policies DM1, DM11 and DM14.
Supplementary Planning Documents: Quality Places; Residential Parking Standards; Character Area Appraisals (ELAC – 30).

Assessment:
The development is considered acceptable and complies with policies DM1, DM11 and DM14 from the 2016-2036 local plan, in that: <u>Principle:</u> • The development is within the urban edge where the principle of development is acceptable, subject to the detailed matters according with the relevant planning policies.

Design and layout:

- The design of the single storey side extension is sympathetic to the host dwelling, modest in scale and well-suited in terms of its form and appearance.
- The application does not propose any additional bedrooms or impact upon the current parking to the site. Current parking arrangements would therefore not be affected by this application.
- Its design allows the host dwelling to maintain sufficient amenity space and retain side access to the rear garden and, as such, would not represent overdevelopment of the site.
- By using materials to match the host dwelling, the proposal is considered to respect the character and appearance of the host dwelling.
- Owing to its position towards the end of a close of properties, the development is not likely to be overly prominent within the street scene.
- The proposal is therefore considered to accord with policy DM1 (Local Plan 2016-2036) in that the extension takes account of its locality through appropriate materials, layout and scale.

Residential amenity:

- The development accords with the guidance set out in the 'Quality Places' SPD in that there will be no unacceptable impact on the amenity of the neighbouring properties in terms of loss of privacy, light or outlook.
- All proposed windows are at ground floor level and forward or rear facing, meaning that significant impact on neighbouring privacy is unlikely.
- The single storey nature of the proposal coupled with adequate distancing from neighbouring properties is such that significant impact on neighbouring light and outlook is unlikely.

Other matters:

- The Council's Tree Officer has recommended a condition requiring that a Tree Protection Plan is submitted to and approved by the LPA to ensure significant trees are protected during construction. Subject to compliance with this pre-commencement condition, there will be no adverse impact on trees or other natural features worthy of retention.
- There are no likely significant impacts on the SPA.

Climate Change:

In July 2019, the Council declared a Climate Change and Environmental Emergency. In doing so it agreed, among other things, to: (a) put in place measures to ensure the Council's own operations and functions achieve carbon neutrality by 2025; (b) work with partners to aim for all projects and services delivered in the Borough to achieve carbon neutrality by 2030; (c) ensure that the Council's procurement policy recognises carbon neutrality as one of its primary considerations; and (d) recognise the urgency of action to mitigate and adapt to climate change in every decision taken by the Council. This is underpinned by the Climate and Environment Emergency Strategy 2020–2030 and the supporting Climate and Environmental Emergency Action Plan – Update June 2020.

The declaration of the Climate Change and Environmental Emergency demonstrates a strong commitment from the Council to achieve net zero. The NPPF, development plan and adopted local plan policy do not set this as a specific target, but it is a material consideration to be considered alongside all other material considerations. In any case addressing climate change is a core part of the NPPF and local plan policy. The need to support the economy is part of the Strategic Environmental Assessment for the adopted local plan, as is an assessment of climate impacts.

Equalities Implications:

Section 149 of the Equalities Act 2010 created the public sector equality duty. Section 149 states:

- A public authority must, in the exercise of its functions, have due regard to the need to:
 - a. eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act;
 - b. advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it;
 - c. foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.

When making policy decisions, the Council must take account of the equality duty and in particular any potential impact on protected groups. It is considered that this application does not raise any equality implications

Conclusion:

Recommendation:	PERMIT ☒	REFUSE ☐
-----------------	---	--

Comments ...
